



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/719,422	12/12/2000	Yoshihisa Furuta	Q 62228	7788
7590 11/23/2004			EXAMINER	
Sughrue Mion Zinn Macpeak & Seas 2100 Pennsylvania Avenue NW Washington, DC 20037			MUSSEY, BARBARA J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1733	

DATE MAILED: 11/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/719,422

Applicant(s)

FURUTA ET AL.

Examiner

Barbara J. Musser

Art Unit

1733

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 October 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 6-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 6-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 6(1)-8(1), 10(1)-14(1), 18(1), and 19(1) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mostafazadeh et al. in view of Lin et al. and Senoo et al. (U.S. Patent 5,705,016) and as evidenced by High Performance Films.

Mostafazadeh et al. discloses adhering an adhesive tape to a lead frame having a chip mounted therein, encapsulating the chip and connectors with molding resin, and stripping the tape away. (Figures 5-7; Col. 1, ll. 63- Col. 2, ll. 19) The reference does not disclose the specifics of the adhesive tape but does disclose the tape can be polyimide. (Col. 3, ll. 46). Lin et al. discloses a method of forming chips which are attached to traces and encapsulated wherein the chips and traces are applied to a Kapton film. (Col. 2, ll. 64- Col. 3, ll. 2) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a Kapton film as the basis for the adhesive tape in Mostafazadeh et al. since Lin et al. discloses Kapton film is a well-known film in this art and since Mostafazadeh et al. discloses that any polyimide film can be used. (Col. 3, ll. 46) Neither reference discloses the thermal shrinkage of the tape. High Performance Films discloses that Kapton has thermal shrinkage of 0.10% at

200C. Thus one in the art would understand the film of Lin et al. in the process of Mostafazadeh et al. would have a shrinkage of less than 3%.

While Mostafazadeh et al. does not specifically disclose using a mold to form the resin encapsulated chips, the reference does disclose that a molded plastic casing is formed over the chip.(Col. 2, ll. 13-14) One in the art would understand that a molded casing was made using a mold.

Neither reference discloses the type of adhesive used. Senoo et al. discloses a pressure sensitive adhesive used to hold wafers in place for dicing which has a low adhesive strength(less than 300 gf/25cm) to prevent the adhesive from sticking the frame around the wafer.(Col. 1, ll. 11-16; Col. 4, ll. 63-65) The adhesive can be silicone based.(Col. 4, ll. 52-54) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use any of the adhesives of Senoo et al. such as one based on silicone on the film of Lin et al. in the process of Mostafazadeh et al. since the adhesive can hold electronic parts securely and prevents the transfer of adhesive to the material it is attached to(Col. 1, ll. 11-16) which is important since the chip bottoms of Mostafazadeh et al. can be bonded to other materials as is known in the electronics arts and particularly since the adhesive is known in the electronic arts. The reference does not suggest the adhesive increases in strength after heating, and absent evidence to that effect, one in the art would expect the adhesive strength to remain the same after heating.

Regarding claims 6(1) and 7(1), High Performance Films discloses Kapton has a thermal shrinkage of 0.1% at 200C.

Regarding claims 8(1) and 19(1), Senoo et al. discloses the adhesive strength is 10-300 gf/25mm.(Col. 4, ll. 65)

Regarding claims 10(1) and 11(1), Senoo et al. discloses the tape substrate can be 15-100 microns thick.(Col. 4, ll. 43)

Regarding claims 12(1) and 13(1), Senoo et al. discloses the adhesive can be 5-50 microns thick.(Col. 4, ll. 54)

Regarding claim 14(1), Senoo et al. discloses it is known to use adhesives that cross-link with ultraviolet reducing the adhesive strength.(Col. 6, ll. 66- Col. 7, ll. 2) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include cross-linking materials in the adhesive layer of Mostafazadeh et al., Lin et al., and Senoo et al. since cross-linking the adhesive reduces its adhesive strength as shown by Senoo et al.(Col. 6, ll. 65- Col. 7, ll. 2) and a low adhesive strength material separates cleanly from the surface to which it is adhered(Col. 1, ll. 11-16) which is important since the chip bottoms of Mostafazadeh et al. can be bonded to other materials as is known in the electronics arts and clean surfaces are easier to bond.

3. Claim 9(1) is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Wang(U.S. Patent 6,306,497).

The references cited above do not disclose the adhesive containing a heat-resistant filler. Wang discloses a method of controlling the peel strength of an adhesive by controlling the number of glass microspheres in the adhesive.(Abstract) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

to include glass microspheres in the adhesive of Mostafazadeh et al., Lin et al. and Senoo et al. since this would allow control of the peel strength of the adhesive since a low adhesive strength is desired as shown by Senoo et al. and since Wang shows glass microspheres can modify the adhesive strength.(Abstract)

4. Claim 15(1) is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Kraft et al.(U.S. Patent 4,240,938).

The references cited above do not disclose surface roughening the substrate before applying the adhesive to it. It is well-known and conventional in the adhesive arts in general to roughen a surface prior to applying adhesive to provide a better surface of the adhesive to bond to, as shown for example by Kraft which discloses roughening the surface of a substrate before applying the adhesive.(Col. 17, ll. 13-19) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to roughen the surface of the substrate before applying the adhesive since such is well-known and conventional in the art as shown for example by Kraft which discloses roughening the surface of a substrate before applying the adhesive.(Col. 17, ll. 13-19)

5. Claims 16(1) and 17(1) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Fjelstad(U.S. Patent 6,001,671).

The references cited above do not disclose the adhesive containing heat-conductive particles. Fjelstad discloses an adhesive adjacent a chip which contains heat-conductive particles so there is a path to draw heat away from the chip during

thermal processing.(Col. 4, ll. 38-45) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include heat conductive particles in the adhesive so there is a path to draw heat away from the chip.(Col. 4, ll. 38-45)

6. Claims 2, 6(2)-8(2), 10(2)-14(2), 18(2), and 19(2) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mostafazadeh et al. in view of Lin et al., Senoo et al., and High Performance Films as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Oida et al.(WO 98/35382) U.S. Patent 6,291,274 is considered an English language translation and all column and line numbers refer to it.

The references cited above do not disclose replacing the lead frame of Mostafazadeh et al. with a tape carrier. Oida et al. discloses tape carriers can be used in place of lead frames when encapsulating chips in resin.(Col. 10, ll. 39-45) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to replace the lead frame of Mostafazadeh et al. with a tape carrier since such is well-known and conventional in the art as shown for example by Oida et al.(Col. 10, ll. 39-45)

Regarding claims 6(2) and 7(2), High Performance Films discloses Kapton has a thermal shrinkage of 0.1% at 200C.

Regarding claims 8(2) and 19(2), Senoo et al. discloses the adhesive strength is 10-300 gf/25mm.(Col. 4, ll. 65)

Regarding claims 10(2) and 11(2), Senoo et al. discloses the tape substrate can be 15-100 microns thick.(Col. 4, ll. 43)

Regarding claims 12(2) and 13(2), Senoo et al. discloses the adhesive can be 5-50 microns thick.(Col. 4, ll. 54)

Regarding claim 14(2), Senoo et al. discloses it is known to use adhesives that cross-link with ultraviolet reducing the adhesive strength.(Col. 6, ll. 66- Col. 7, ll. 2) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include cross-linking materials in the adhesive layer of Mostafazadeh et al., Lin et al., Senoo et al., and Oida et al. since cross-linking the adhesive reduces its adhesive strength as shown by Senoo et al.(Col. 6, ll. 65- Col. 7, ll. 2) and a low adhesive strength material separates cleanly from the surface to which it is adhered(Col. 1, ll. 11-16) which is important since the chip bottoms of Mostafazadeh et al. can be bonded to other materials as is known in the electronics arts and clean surfaces are easier to bond.

7. Claim 9(2) is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Wang(U.S. Patent 6,306,497).

The references cited above do not disclose the adhesive containing a heat-resistant filler. Wang discloses a method of controlling the peel strength of an adhesive by controlling the number of glass microspheres in the adhesive.(Abstract) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include glass microspheres in the adhesive of Mostafazadeh et al., Lin et al., Senoo et al., and Oida et al. since this would allow control of the peel strength of the adhesive

since a low adhesive strength is desired as shown by Senoo et al. and since Wang shows glass microspheres can modify the adhesive strength.(Abstract)

8. Claim 15(2) is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Kraft et al.(U.S. Patent 4,240,938).

The references cited above do not disclose surface roughening the substrate before applying the adhesive to it. It is well-known and conventional in the adhesive arts in general to roughen a surface prior to applying adhesive to provide a better surface of the adhesive to bond to, as shown for example by Kraft which discloses roughening the surface of a substrate before applying the adhesive.(Col. 17, ll. 13-19) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to roughen the surface of the substrate before applying the adhesive since such is well-known and conventional in the art as shown for example by Kraft which discloses roughening the surface of a substrate before applying the adhesive.(Col. 17, ll. 13-19)

9. Claims 16(2) and 17(2) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Fjelstad(U.S. Patent 6,001,671).

The references cited above do not disclose the adhesive containing heat-conductive particles. Fjelstad discloses an adhesive adjacent a chip which contains heat-conductive particles so there is a path to draw heat away from the chip during thermal processing.(Col. 4, ll. 38-45) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill

in the art at the time the invention was made to include heat conductive particles in the adhesive so there is a path to draw heat away from the chip.(Col. 4, ll. 38-45)

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed 10/1/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding applicant's argument that the references do not disclose a silicone pressure sensitive adhesive, Senoo et al. discloses silicone pressure sensitive adhesives are known to be used with electronics when a low adhesive strength is desired.

Regarding applicant's argument that Mostafazadeh et al. teaches using "polyimide as an adhesive layer"(Applicant's Arguments, line 13), Mostafazadeh et al. teaches an adhesive layer "such as polyimide WITH an adhesive layer".(Col. 3, ll. 45-46) Therefore the reference teaches a backing for an adhesive tape composed of polyimide combined with an undisclosed adhesive layer.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Barbara J. Musser whose telephone number is (571) 272-1222. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday; alternate Fridays.

Art Unit: 1733

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Blaine Copenheaver can be reached on (571)-272-1156. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



BJM



BLAINE COPENHEAVER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700